

**FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
CEQA FINDINGS**

ALPINE VILLAGE CENTER

**PROJECT NUMBERS S99-047, ER 99-14-036
SCH# 2000061004**

Lead Agency:

County of San Diego
Department of Planning and Land Use
5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B
San Diego, California 92123



San Diego County
DEPT. OF PLANNING & LAND USE

January 2003

Table of Contents

Section	Page
I. Introduction.....	2
II. Definitions.....	2
III. Project Description.....	2
IV. Record of Proceedings	7
V. Findings Required Under CEQA.....	8
VI. Legal Effects of Findings.....	10
VII. Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.....	10
VIII. Project-level Impacts Determined to be Significant and Unavoidable.....	11
IX. Project-level Impacts Determined to be Significant and Mitigable.....	13
X. Cumulative Impacts Determined to be Significant and Unavoidable.....	22
XI. Cumulative Impacts Determined to be Significant and Mitigable.....	22
XII. Feasibility of Project Alternatives	24

I. INTRODUCTION

The following findings are made relative to the conclusions of the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the Alpine Village Center Draft EIR (State Clearinghouse Number 2000061004). The FEIR prepared for the Alpine Village Center, addresses the environmental impacts of the implementation of the proposed Project described in Section III below. In addition to the proposed Project evaluated in the FEIR, the FEIR evaluated eight alternatives to the Project. These include the Reduced Project-Reduced Transportation/Circulation Impact Alternative, Residential Development of the Project Site, No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative, Alternative Location – Shaw Property, Alternative Location – Dyke Property, Reduced Project – No Gas Station, Reduced Project – Local Serving Retail – No Supermarket, and Reduced Supermarket Facility Alternative.

II. DEFINITIONS

“CEQA” means the California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code Sections 21000-21178.1.

“CEQA Guidelines” means the State of California Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, California Code Regs. Tit. 14 15000-15387.

“County” means the County of San Diego.

“Draft EIR” means the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Alpine Village Center dated May 2002.

“EIR” means an environmental impact report.

“MMRP” means the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

“Project” means the Alpine Village Center project described in the Draft EIR.

III. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The FEIR evaluates in detail the proposed Project described below; however, after consideration of the proposed Project and the alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIR, the decision-making body elected to approve the No Gas Station – Small Retail Shop Building alternative as described and evaluated in Section 4.8 of the FEIR and Section XII. F of these Findings. Any potential differences between the proposed Project components and/or effects and those of the approved No Gas Station – Small Retail Shop Building alternative are addressed in ***bold italics*** throughout these findings.

Project Description and Location

The proposed Alpine Village Center is located in the central portion of San Diego County in the unincorporated community of Alpine. Regional access to the project site is provided by Interstate 8 (I-8), located to the north of the project site. Local access is provided via Highlands View Road, South Grade Road, Honey Hill Ranch Road, Alpine Boulevard and East Victoria Drive. More specifically, the project site is located at the southeast corner of the intersection of Alpine Boulevard and South Grade Road.

The Project is the construction and operation of a neighborhood retail shopping center located on an approximately 9.65 acre site. The shopping center consists of four commercial structures – a supermarket-drugstore, a multi-tenant retail building, a fast food restaurant with drive-thru, and a gas station/mini-mart. Total Project square footage is approximately 72,275. ***The No Gas Station – Small Retail Shop Building alternative assumes development of the proposed project site with the proposed supermarket, fast service restaurant and retail shops, and a 5,000 square foot retail shop building in place of the gas station/mini-mart.***

Parking will be provided throughout the site. A majority of the parking will serve the supermarket and will be provided in the central portion of the project site, north of the supermarket. Additional parking will be provided around the retail building in the northeastern portion of the project site, near the intersection of Alpine Boulevard and Honey Hill Ranch Road.

Access to the neighborhood shopping center will be provided via one point along Alpine Boulevard, one point along Highlands View Road and one point from Honey Hill Ranch Road. The following provides a specific description of each of the Project components.

Supermarket

The primary component of the commercial center is a 57,961 square foot supermarket with a pharmacy. This supermarket will serve as the anchor for the Alpine Village Center. An anchor is necessary to obtain financing for the Project and to increase the economic vitality and viability of the shopping center. The commitment of an anchor to a shopping center shows lenders that an anchor is willing to spend a substantial amount of money at the project site and will provide a stream of customers for the remainder of the development, which is often critical to the success of the other tenants. Without an anchor to bring in customers with its broad array of goods, services, and advertising, many of the small shop tenants would not be able to succeed in attracting sufficient customers to remain economically viable.

The supermarket will be located in the southern portion of the project site, north of a non-buildable area that will remain in a natural or landscaped condition. The supermarket building will be the tallest building in the commercial center at 29 feet in height, with architectural projections of up to 39 feet. The supermarket will have authority to operate between 6 am and midnight and may also receive deliveries between 6 AM and 10 PM. A

truck loading dock and trash compactor will be located adjacent to the southeast portion of the building. Extensive landscaping and stone pavers will be provided along the perimeter of the building.

Alcoholic beverages will be sold at the supermarket for off-site consumption. The Project has received approval from the State of California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control for such activity.

Retail Building

A 9,000 square foot retail building providing space for up to seven (projected) retail shops is proposed in the northeastern portion of the project site, near the corner of Honey Hill Ranch Road and Alpine Boulevard. Primary access to this building will be provided via Alpine Boulevard. Extensive landscaping, stone pavers, and a patio will be provided around the front (north-facing side) of the retail building. The retail building may operate on a 24-hour basis.

Gas Station/Mini-Mart

The Project also proposes a gas station and mini-mart in the northern portion of the project site, easily accessible from a northern access point along Alpine Boulevard. The station would provide four (4) fuel pump islands with eight (8) pumps in addition to the 2,029 square foot mini-mart. The gas station and mini-mart will have authority to operate on a 24-hour basis and will sell beer and wine for off-premises consumption. Extensive landscaping will be provided around the gas station/mini-mart, particularly fronting Alpine Boulevard and the Alpine Boulevard access point. ***The approved No Gas Station – Small Retail Shop Building alternative will not provide a gas station/mini-mart. Instead, a 5,000 square foot retail shop building will be provided in place of the gas station/mini-mart. The replacement retail building may operate on a 24-hour basis.***

Fast Food Restaurant/Drive-Thru

The Project proposes a 3,285 square foot fast food restaurant with a drive-thru lane with a speaker system in the western portion of the project site, with primary access provided by Highlands View Road and Alpine Boulevard. This restaurant includes an outdoor patio on the eastern portion of the building. Rock and vegetation landscaping will also be provided around the restaurant. This restaurant will have the authority to operate from 6 AM to midnight.

Parking

The proposed Project will provide 325 parking spaces and 3 loading bays. A majority of the parking will serve the supermarket and will be located in the central portion of the site. However, additional parking will be provided adjacent to the remaining three commercial structures. Eleven of the parking spaces will be handicapped accessible and two spaces are specifically set aside for RV parking. The 325 spaces meet the County of

San Diego's parking requirements and provide a parking/building ratio of 4.5 spaces per 1,000 square feet of building floor area.

Bicycle Spaces

The County of San Diego has a bicycle space requirement for commercial developments. According to County standards, the proposed Project must provide 33 bicycle spaces.

The Project proposes 35 bicycle spaces in five racks in the project area – 14 spaces near the supermarket, 7 on the east side of the retail shop building, 7 adjacent to the gas station/mini-mart (or replacement shop building), and 7 near the fast food restaurant.

On-Site Improvements

On-site improvements not discussed above include: installation of drainage control improvements in the parking lot; installation of site design and source control water quality facilities; lighting; landscaping; a 19-foot high screen wall along the truck loading dock for the supermarket; and a 4-foot to 6-foot high wall along the eastern boundary of the project site. The site will be landscaped along street frontages, around buildings and throughout the parking lot, except for an approximately 1.2-acre area in the southern portion of the site, which will be left in its natural condition. Approximately 35 percent of the site will either be landscaped or left in its natural condition.

Off-Site Circulation Improvements

As mitigation for traffic impacts: i) Alpine Boulevard will be improved to a three-lane Town Collector Road standard from West Victoria Drive to a point approximately 100 feet east of Marshall Road and ii) a signal will be installed at the intersection of Alpine Boulevard and West Victoria Drive/Arnold Way. All off-site circulation improvements, including Alpine Boulevard and re-aligned South Grade Road have been or will be completed within the public rights-of-way in compliance with the San Diego County Centerline Ordinance.

The project is also installing a traffic signal at Alpine Boulevard and West Victoria/Arnold, making street improvements in the same area, paying \$130,000 as its share of the cost of the realignment of South Grade Road, installing street and sidewalk and curb and gutters in the Alpine Boulevard right of way along the project frontage, and paying approximately \$89,000 in fair share fees. In total, the project is making over \$500,000 of improvements or contributions to the Alpine circulation system even though the project is not generating enough traffic to result in a significant impact to the Alpine Boulevard/South Grade Road intersection, which is located at the northwestern corner of the project site.

Off-Site Drainage Improvement

The Project will involve paving a concrete floor approximately 8 feet in width and 12 feet in length under Facility 34 of the County of San Diego Flood Control Comprehensive Plan. Facility 34 is a concrete bridge resting on poured-in-place buttresses that clearly show the imprint of the forms used. The Project will also involve removing the form features in the buttresses. The flow of runoff through this facility, located at Olivewood Lane and Tavern Way, will be improved by pouring a concrete floor under the bridge and removing the form features in the buttresses. By replacing these rough areas with smooth surfaces, the hydraulics and overall operation of the poured-in-place buttresses will be improved.

Project Grading and Construction

The Project will involve the grading of approximately 70,000 cubic yards of balanced cut and fill, including the creation of an approximately 45-foot high 1.5:1 slope immediately adjacent to and south of the proposed supermarket building. Rock is expected to be encountered and is expected to be removable, but a minor amount of blasting may be required. If blasting occurs, it will be intermittent and will occur over an approximately one month period. Some of the rock that may be removed is in exposed outcroppings. The overall construction of the Project, including the on-site and off-site improvements, is anticipated to take approximately ten months (subject to unanticipated delays), with operation of the Alpine Village Center anticipated 15 months after final Project approvals and issuance of building and grading permits. It is anticipated the Project would open in January of 2004.

Engelmann Oaks

As required by the Alpine Design Review Board, the Engelmann oak in the southwestern portion of the site will be retained and the two other Engelmann oaks will be relocated on-site. If relocation of the two Engelmann oaks is infeasible, two 36" Engelmann oaks will be placed within the landscaped areas of the proposed site plan.

IV. RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

For purposes of CEQA and these Findings, the Record of Proceedings for the Project consists of the following documents, at a minimum:

- The Notice of Preparation, Notice of Completion, Notice of Availability, and all other public notices issued by the County in conjunction with the Project;
- The previously circulated (June 1, 2000 through July 3, 2000) Mitigated Negative Declaration
- The Draft EIR;
- The Final EIR;

- All comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the public comment period on the Draft EIR;
- All responses to all written comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the public comment period on the Draft EIR;
- All written comments and correspondence submitted to the County with respect to the Project, in addition to timely comments on the Draft EIR;
- The MMRP;
- All findings and resolutions adopted by the County decision makers in connection with the Project, and all documents cited or referred to therein;
- All final reports, studies, memoranda, maps, staff reports, or other planning documents relating to the Project prepared by the County, consultants, or responsible or trustee agencies with respect to the County's compliance with the requirements of CEQA and with respect to the County's actions on the Project;
- All documents submitted to the County by other public agencies or members of the public in conjunction with the Project, up through the close of any required public hearing;
- Minutes and/or verbatim transcripts of all public meetings, and/or public hearings held by the County in connection with the Project;
- Matters of common knowledge to the County, including, but not limited to federal, state, and local laws and regulations;
- Any documents expressly cited in these Findings, in addition to those cited above; and
- Any other materials required to be in the record of proceedings by Section 21167.6 (e) of CEQA.

The custodian of the documents comprising the record of proceedings is the County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use, 5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B, San Diego, California 92123. Copies of all these documents, which constitute the record of proceedings upon which the County's decision is based, are and at all relevant times have been available upon request at all times at the offices of the County, the custodian for such documents or other materials.

The County has relied on all of the documents listed above in reaching its decision on the Alpine Village Center. Without exception, any documents set forth above not found in the Project files fall into one of two categories. First, many of them reflect prior planning or legislative decisions of which the County was aware in approving the Project. (See City of Santa Cruz v. Local Agency Formation Commission 76 Cal.App.3d 381, 391-392, 142 Cal.Rptr. 873 (1978); Dominey v. Department of Personnel Administration, 205 Cal.App.3d 729, 738, n.6, 252 Cal.Rptr. 620 (1988).) Second, the documents influenced the expert advice provided to County Staff or consultants, who then provided advice to the County. For that reason, such documents form part of the underlying factual basis for the County's decisions relating to the adoption of the Alpine Village Center Project. (See Pub. Res. Code § 21167.6(e)(10); Browning-Ferris Industries v. City Council of City of San Jose, 181 Cal.App.3d 852, 866, 226 Cal.Rptr. 575 (1986); Stanislaus Audubon Society, Inc. v. County of Stanislaus, 33 Cal.App.4th 144, 153, 155, 39 Cal.Rptr.2d 54 (1985).)

The Draft EIR was completed in compliance with CEQA, and reflects the County's independent judgment. The County has considered evidence and arguments presented to the County during consideration of this matter. In determining whether the Project has a significant impact on the environment, and in adopting Findings pursuant to Section 21081 of CEQA, the County has complied with CEQA Sections 21081.5 and 21082.2.

V. FINDINGS REQUIRED UNDER CEQA

Section 21002 of CEQA provides that “public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would *substantially lessen* the significant environmental effects of such projects[.]” Pub.Res.Code § 21002 (emphasis added). The same statute states that the procedures required by CEQA “are intended to assist public agencies in systematically identifying both the significant effects of proposed projects and the feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures which will *avoid* or *substantially lessen* such significant effects.” *Id.* (emphasis added). Section 21002 also states that “in the event [that] specific economic, social, or other conditions make infeasible such project alternatives or such mitigation measures, individual projects may be approved in spite of one or more significant effects.” *Id.*

The mandate and principles announced in Public Resources Code Section 21002 are implemented, in part, through the requirement that agencies must adopt findings before approving projects for which EIRs are required. (See Pub. Res. Code § 21081(a); California. Code Regs. tit. 14 § 15091(a).) For each significant environmental effect identified in any EIR for a proposed project, the approving agency must issue a written finding reaching one or more of three permissible conclusions. The first such finding is that “[c]hanges or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.” (California. Code Regs. tit. 14 § 15091(a)(1).) The second permissible finding is that “[s]uch changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency and not the agency making the finding. (California. Code Regs. tit 14 § 15091 (a)(2).) The third potential conclusion is that “[s]pecific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.: (CEQA Guidelines, § 15091 (a)(3).) Public Resources Code Section 21061.1 defines “feasible” to mean “capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social and technological factors.” CEQA Guidelines Section 15364 adds another factor: “legal” considerations. (See also Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors (“Goleta II”), 52 California.3d 553, 565, 276 Cal.Rptr. 410 (1990).)

The concept of feasibility also encompasses the question of whether a particular alternative or mitigation measure promotes the underlying goals and objectives of a project. (*City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego*, 133 Cal.App.3d 410, 417, 183 Cal.Rptr. 898 (1982).) [F]easibility under CEQA encompasses desirability to the extent that desirability is based on a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, social and technological factors. (*Id.*; see also *Sequoyah Hills Homeowners Assn v. City of Oakland*, 23 Cal.App.4th 704, 715, 29 Cal.Rptr.2d 182 (1993).)

The CEQA guidelines do not define the difference between “avoiding” a significant environmental effect and merely “substantially lessening” such an effect. The County therefore must glean the meaning of these terms from the other contexts in which the terms are used. Section 21081 of CEQA, on which CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 is based, uses the term “mitigate” rather than “substantially lessen.” The CEQA Guidelines therefore equate “mitigating” with “substantially lessening.” Such an understanding of the statutory term is consistent with the policies underlying CEQA, which include the policy that “public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of such projects.” (Pub. Res. Code § 21002.)

For the purposes of these Findings, the term “avoid” refers to the effectiveness of one or more mitigation measures to reduce an otherwise significant effect to a less than significant level. In contrast, the term “substantially lessen” refers to the effectiveness of such measure or measures to substantially reduce the severity of a significant effect, but not to reduce that effect to a less than significant level. These interpretations appear to be mandated by the holding in *Laurel Hills Homeowners Assn v. City Council*, 83 Cal.App.3d 515, 519-527, 147 Cal.Rptr. 842 (1978), in which the Court of Appeals held that an agency had satisfied its obligation to substantially lessen or avoid significant effects by adopting numerous mitigation measures, not all of which rendered the significant impacts in question (e.g., the “loss of biological resources”) less than significant.

Although CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 requires only that approving agencies specify that a particular significant effect is “avoid[ed] or substantially lessen[ed],” these Findings, for purposes of clarity, in each case will specify whether the effect in question has been reduced to a less than significant level, or has simply been substantially lessened but remains significant.

In the Findings document, the degree of the significance of the impact(s) identified should also be considered. For example, in the case of this project, a significant impact is identified at the Tavern Road/Interstate 8 interchange and at the intersection of Tavern Way and Arnold Way because even the addition of one vehicular trip to these intersections would exceed the County’s threshold of adding two seconds to the existing intersection delays. In effect, the project has been found to result in a significant and unavoidable impact at the Tavern Road and Interstate 8 eastbound interchange when the project only adds 12 AM (an average of one trip every 5 minutes) peak hour trips and 13

PM (an average of one trip every 4.5 minutes) peak hour trips resulting in an increase in PM peak hour delay of up to 6.3 seconds.

CEQA requires that the lead agency adopt mitigation measures or alternatives, where feasible, to substantially lessen or avoid significant environmental impacts that would otherwise occur. Project modification or alternatives are not required; however, where such changes are infeasible or where the responsibility for modifying the project lies with some other agency. (California. Code Regs. tit. 14 § 15091(a),(b).)

With respect to a project for which significant impacts are not avoided or substantially lessened either through the adoption of feasible mitigation measures or feasible environmentally superior alternatives, a public agency, after adopting proper findings, may nevertheless approve the project if the agency first adopts a statement of overriding considerations setting forth the specific reasons why the agency found that the project's benefits rendered acceptable its unavoidable adverse environmental effects. (California. Code Regs. tit. 14 § 15093, 15043(b); see also Pub. Res. Code § 21081(b).) The California Supreme Court has stated that, "[t]he wisdom of approving...any development project, a delicate task which requires a balancing of interests, is necessarily left to the sound discretion of the local officials and their constituents who are responsible for such decisions. The law as we interpret and apply it simply requires that those decisions be informed, and therefore balanced." (*Goleta II*, 52 California.3d 553, 576.). As stated above, the degree of the significance of the impact(s) identified should also be considered by the decision makers during their approval of a project.

VI. LEGAL EFFECTS OF FINDINGS

To the extent that these Findings conclude that various proposed mitigation measures outlined in the Draft EIR are feasible and have not been modified, superseded or withdrawn, the County hereby binds itself to implement these measures. These Findings, in other words, are not merely informational, but rather constitute a binding set of obligations that will come into effect when County decision makers formally approve the Project. The mitigation measures will be included as conditions of approval on the final site plan for the project.

VII. MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

CEQA requires the lead agency approving a project to adopt an MMRP for the changes to the project that it has adopted or made a condition of project approval in order to ensure compliance with project implementation. An MMRP has been defined and serves that function for this Final EIR.

The MMRP is provided under a separate cover. The MMRP designates responsibility and anticipated timing for the implementation of mitigation. The County will serve as the overall MMRP Coordinator.

An MMRP has been prepared for the Project and has been adopted concurrently with these Findings. (See Pub. Res. Code Section 21081.6(a)(1). The County will use the MMRP to track compliance with Project mitigation measures. The MMRP will remain available for public review during the compliance period. ***All project mitigation measures and design considerations identified throughout Section 2.0 of the EIR, and summarized in Section 9.0 of the EIR, and indicated in these Findings apply to the No Gas Station – Small Retail Shop Building Alternative.***

VIII. PROJECT LEVEL IMPACTS DETERMINED TO BE SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE

A. Transportation/Circulation

Significant and Unavoidable Impact A-1:

Since signalization is presently warranted at the Tavern Road/Interstate 8 westbound and eastbound ramp interchange under existing conditions and Project traffic will exacerbate the circulation problems at these intersections, the Project will result in a significant impact to the I-8/Tavern Road interchange (FEIR, 2-11).

The No Gas Station – Small Retail Shop Building alternative will reduce average daily vehicle trips to the site by a net of 680 trips (FEIR, 4-25). These 680 fewer trips would not avoid any transportation circulation impact associated with the proposed project. However, even this minimal reduction in traffic would result in shorter delays at the Tavern Road/I-8 interchange ramps. (FEIR, 4-26)

Finding:

Pursuant to CEQA §15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the FEIR. However, pursuant to CEQA §15091(a)(3), specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the FEIR.

Rationale:

At the currently failing Tavern Road/I-8 interchange intersections, even the addition of one vehicular trip would exceed the County's threshold of adding two seconds to the existing intersection delay. At the westbound Tavern Road and Interstate 8 interchange, project traffic adds 5 AM (an average of one trip every 12 minutes) and 7 PM (an average of one trip every 8.5 minutes) peak hour trips resulting in an increase in delay of up to 9.6 seconds. At the Tavern Road and Interstate 8 eastbound interchange, the project traffic adds 12 AM (an average of one trip every 5 minutes) peak hour trips and 13 PM (an average of one trip every 4.5 minutes) peak hour trips resulting in an increase in PM peak hour delay of up to 6.3 seconds. This increase is considered a significant impact. (FEIR,

2-11)

Implementation of Mitigation Measure TC1 as follows will reduce the Project's contribution to the significant impact to the Tavern Road/Interstate 8 eastbound and westbound ramps to a level less than significant once the signals are installed because the Tavern Road/I-8 interchange would operate at an acceptable LOS C with signals.

TC1. Prior to obtaining any building or other permit pursuant to this site plan, and prior to commencement of construction or use of the property in reliance on this site plan, the applicant shall pay a "fair share" contribution as determined by the County of San Diego Public Works Department based on Caltrans estimates for the signalization of the Tavern Road/Interstate 8 eastbound and westbound ramp intersections. That contribution would be approximately \$4,539 for the westbound ramp and \$8,170 for the eastbound ramp for a total of \$12,709. The applicant must also pay approximately \$9,267 for the construction of street and ramp facilities, such as pavements, realignments of horizontal and vertical curves, storm drains, grading, etc. for the Interstate 8 eastbound ramp/Tavern Road intersection. Thus, the grand fair share total due for Mitigation Measure TC1 is approximately \$21,976. Proof of payment of this fair share contribution must be made to the Director of DPW prior to any occupancy or use of the premises pursuant to this site plan (FEIR, 2-17).

Because the proposed Project would be in operation and add trips to the Tavern Road and Interstate 8 interchange for potentially 0.5 to 3.5 years prior to the estimated installation of the improvements by Caltrans, the impact at this intersection will remain significant and unavoidable in the short-term (i.e., between the time the Project is in operation and until the improvements are installed by Caltrans). Once the signals are installed between June 2004 and June 2007, the long-term project impact will be reduced to a level less than significant.

The Reduced Transportation/Circulation Impact Alternative, Residential Development, Reduced Project - No Gas Station, Reduced Project - No Supermarket; Reduced Supermarket Facility, and No Gas Station - Small Retail Shop Building alternatives would reduce transportation impacts to this interchange; however, as described in more detail in Section XII. Feasibility of Project Alternatives, none of these alternatives would reduce this impact to a level less than significant.

Significant and Unavoidable Impact A-2:

Even the addition of one vehicular trip would exceed the County's threshold of adding two seconds to the existing intersection delay. Because the Tavern Road/Arnold Way intersection presently warrants signalization and the proposed Project will exacerbate the circulation problem at this intersection, the proposed Project will result in a significant impact (FEIR, 2-12).

The No Gas Station – Small Retail Shop Building alternative will reduce average daily vehicle trips to the site by a net of 680 trips (FEIR, 4-25). These 680 fewer trips would not avoid this transportation circulation impact that is associated with the proposed project (FEIR, 4-26).

Finding:

Pursuant to CEQA §15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the FEIR. However, pursuant to CEQA §15091(a)(3), specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the FEIR.

Rationale:

Implementation of Mitigation Measure TC2 as follows will reduce the Project's contribution to the significant impact at Tavern Road/Arnold Way to a level less than significant once the signal is installed because the Tavern Road/Arnold Way intersection would operate at an acceptable LOS C with a signal.

TC2. Prior to obtaining any building or other permit pursuant to this site plan, and prior to commencement of construction or use of the property in reliance on this site plan, the applicant shall pay a "fair share" contribution as determined by the County of San Diego Public Works Department under the County of San Diego Traffic Signal Participation Fee Program toward the signalization of the Tavern Road/Arnold Way intersection. That contribution will be approximately \$8,715. Proof of payment of this fair share contribution must be made to the Director of DPW prior to any occupancy or use of the premises pursuant to this site plan (FEIR, 2-17).

Since the signal is not scheduled for installation by the County of San Diego Public Works Department until approximately 5 years from receipt of the fair share payment, and because the Project will contribute trips to this intersection for potentially 4 years prior to the estimated installation of the signal, the impact will remain significant and unavoidable impact in the short-term (i.e., between the time the Project is in operation and until the improvements are installed by Caltrans).

The Reduced Transportation/Circulation Impact Alternative, Residential Development, Reduced Project No Gas Station, Reduced Project – No Supermarket, Reduced Supermarket Facility, and No Gas Station – Small Retail Shop Building alternatives would reduce transportation impacts to this interchange; however, as described in more detail in Section XII. Feasibility of Project Alternatives, none of these alternatives would reduce this impact to a level less than significant.

IX. PROJECT LEVEL IMPACT DETERMINED TO BE SIGNIFICANT AND MITIGABLE

The following describes project-level impacts determined to be significant and mitigable in the FEIR.

A. Transportation

Significant Impact A-1:

Since signalization is presently warranted at the Tavern Road/Interstate 8 westbound and eastbound ramp interchange under existing conditions and Project traffic will exacerbate the circulation problems at these intersections, the Project will result in a significant impact to the I-8/Tavern Road interchange (FEIR, 2-11).

The Reduced Project-No Gas Station alternative will reduce average daily vehicle trips to the site by a net of 680 trips (FEIR, 4-25). These 680 fewer trips would not avoid any transportation circulation impact associated with the proposed project. However, even this minimal reduction in traffic would result in shorter delays at the Tavern Road/I-8 interchange ramps. (FEIR, 4-26)

Finding:

Pursuant to CEQA Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the FEIR.

Rationale:

Implementation of Mitigation Measure TC1 will reduce the Project's contribution to the significant impact to the Tavern Road/Interstate 8 eastbound and westbound ramps to a level less than significant once the signals are installed because the Tavern Road/I-8 interchange would operate at an acceptable LOS C with signals. Once the signals are installed as planned between June 2004 and June 2007, the long-term Project impact will be reduced to a level less than significant.

- TC1. Prior to obtaining any building or other permit pursuant to this site plan, and prior to commencement of construction or use of the property in reliance on this site plan, the applicant shall pay a "fair share" contribution as determined by the County of San Diego Public Works Department based on Caltrans estimates for the signalization of the Tavern Road/Interstate 8 eastbound and westbound ramp intersections. That contribution would be approximately \$4,539 for the westbound ramp and \$8,170 for the eastbound ramp for a total of \$12,709. The applicant must also pay approximately \$9,267 for the construction of street and ramp facilities, such as pavements, realignments of horizontal and vertical curves, storm drains, grading, etc. for the Interstate 8 eastbound ramp/Tavern Road

intersection. Thus, the grand fair share total due for Mitigation Measure TC1 is approximately \$21,976. Proof of payment of this fair share contribution must be made to the Director of DPW prior to any occupancy or use of the premises pursuant to this site plan (FEIR, 2-17).

Once the signals are installed as planned between June 2004 and June 2007, the long-term Project impact will be reduced to a level less than significant as the intersection will operate at an acceptable LOS C.

The Reduced Transportation/Circulation Impact Alternative, Residential Development, Reduced Project No Gas Station, Reduced Project – No Supermarket, Reduced Supermarket Facility, and No Gas Station – Small Retail Shop Building alternatives would reduce delays to this intersection in the short-term; however, as described in more detail in Section XII. Feasibility of Project Alternatives, in the long-term, impacts at this intersection would be required to be mitigated to similar levels under either the proposed project or any of these alternatives.

Significant Impact A-2:

Because the Tavern Road/Arnold Way intersection presently warrants signalization and the proposed Project will exacerbate the circulation problem at this intersection, the proposed Project will result in a significant impact (FEIR, 2-11).

The Reduced Project-No Gas Station alternative will reduce average daily vehicle trips to the site by a net of 680 trips (FEIR, 4-15). These 680 fewer trips would not avoid this transportation circulation impact that is associated with the proposed project.

Finding:

Pursuant to CEQA Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the FEIR.

Rationale:

Implementation of Mitigation Measure TC2 will reduce the Project's contribution to the significant impact at Tavern Road/Arnold Way to a level less than significant once the signal is installed because the Tavern Road/Arnold Way intersection would operate at an acceptable LOS C with a signal. Once the signal is installed, as planned within 5 years of receipt of the fair share payment, the long-term Project impact will be reduced to a level less than significant.

TC2. Prior to obtaining any building or other permit pursuant to this site plan, and prior to commencement of construction or use of the property in reliance on this site plan, the applicant shall pay a "fair share" contribution as determined by the County of San Diego Public Works Department under the County of San Diego Traffic Signal Participation Fee Program toward the signalization of the Tavern

Road/Arnold Way intersection. That contribution will be approximately \$8,715. Proof of payment of this fair share contribution must be made to the Director of DPW prior to any occupancy or use of the premises pursuant to this site plan (FEIR, 2-17).

Once the signal is installed, as planned within 5 years of receipt of the fair share payment, the Tavern Road/Arnold Way intersection would operate at an acceptable LOS C, thereby reducing the long-term Project impact to a level less than significant.

The Reduced Transportation/Circulation Impact Alternative, Residential Development, Reduced Project No Gas Station, Reduced Project – No Supermarket, Reduced Supermarket Facility, and No Gas Station – Small Retail Shop Building alternatives would reduce delays to this intersection in the short-term; however, as described in more detail in Section XII. Feasibility of Project Alternatives, in the long-term, impacts at this intersection would be required to be mitigated to similar levels under either the proposed project or any of these alternatives.

Significant Impact A-3:

The addition of Project trips lowers the level of service at the Alpine Boulevard/West Victoria Drive/Arnold Way intersection from LOS C to LOS F. This is considered a significant impact (FEIR, 2-12).

The Reduced Project-No Gas Station alternative will reduce average daily vehicle trips to the site by a net of 680 trips (FEIR, 4-25). These 680 fewer trips would not avoid this transportation circulation impact that is associated with the proposed project (FEIR, 4-26).

Finding:

Pursuant to CEQA Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the FEIR.

Rationale:

Implementation of Mitigation Measure TC3 will reduce the significant impact at the Alpine Boulevard/West Victoria Drive/Arnold Way intersection to a level less than significant. When signalized, this intersection will operate at an acceptable LOS D or better with the existing lane configuration.

TC3. Prior to any occupancy or use of the premises pursuant to this site plan, the applicant shall design and construct a traffic signal at the Alpine Boulevard/West Victoria Drive/Arnold Way intersection. The design and construction of this signal shall be subject to review by the County of San Diego Department of Public Works (DPW) and completed to the satisfaction of the Director of DPW

prior to any occupancy or use of the premises pursuant to this site plan. (FEIR, 2-18)

The construction and operation of a traffic signal construction at the intersection will reduce the significant impact at the intersection to a level less than significant by allowing this intersection to operate at an acceptable LOS D or better.

The Reduced Transportation/Circulation Impact Alternative, Residential Development, Reduced Project - No Gas Station, Reduced Project – No Supermarket, Reduced Supermarket Facility, and No Gas Station – Small Retail Shop Building alternatives would reduce delays to this intersection in the short-term; however, as described in more detail in Section XII. Feasibility of Project Alternatives, in the long-term, impacts at this intersection would be required to be mitigated to similar levels under either the proposed project or any of these alternatives.

B. Air Quality

Significant Impact B-1:

Due to the proximity of the residential uses to the south and west of the project site and the potential for localized dust and PM-10 emissions, the proposed Project will result in a significant short-term air quality impact associated with land disturbance/clearing and grading (FEIR, 2-41).

Finding:

Pursuant to CEQA Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the FEIR.

Rationale:

Implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ1 will reduce the short-term air quality impact associated with land disturbance/clearing and grading to a level less than significant.

AQ1. During blasting, grading, clearing and construction on the project site, the applicant shall implement an enhanced construction activity mitigation program that includes:

- Implementation of a high wind dust control program when wind gusts exceed 25 miles per hour as indicated by visible dust clouds generated on any disturbed (cleared or graded) surfaces. High wind dust control includes:
- Termination of operation of heavy equipment on unpaved surfaces until winds subside;

- Hourly application of water to unpaved surfaces with vehicle or equipment operations;
- Application of water or other dust control material to any previously graded surface if sustained dust emanation is visible from such surface.
- Utilization of measures to prevent dirt from being tracked, washed, blown or otherwise conveyed onto paved roadways, and contractor shall wash or sweep the construction access points on a routine basis during any construction involving significant dirt track-out.
- Where feasible, on-road vehicles and off-road equipment shall be turned off and subsequently restarted if the anticipated duration of idling is expected to exceed five minutes.
- Equipment shall be maintained in proper tune to prevent visible soot from reducing light transmission through the exhaust exit by more than 20 percent for more than three minutes per hour and low-sulfur fuel will be used as required by state regulations.

The above shall be subject to monitoring by the County of San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) and completed to the satisfaction of the SDAPCD (FEIR, 2-50).

During blasting, grading, clearing and construction on the project site, the applicant shall implement the enhanced construction activity mitigation program, which will reduce the potential for localized dust and PM-10 emissions impact to the residential uses located to the south and west of the project site to a level less than significant.

The Reduced Transportation/Circulation alternative, Residential Development alternative, Reduced Project - No Gas Station alternative, and the No Gas Station – Small Retail Shop Building would result in slightly fewer localized air emissions than the proposed project. Please refer to Section XII. Feasibility of Project Alternatives for a more detailed comparison of the proposed project and these alternative, as well as a discussion of the feasibility of these alternatives.

C. Noise

Significant Impact C-1:

The loading dock one-hour average noise level would be approximately 56 dB at the eastern residential property line. This noise level would exceed the County's daytime Noise Ordinance standards by one dB and the nighttime by six dB. This is considered a significant impact (FEIR, 2-55).

Finding:

Pursuant to CEQA Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the FEIR.

Rationale:

Implementation of Mitigation Measure N1 would reduce the impact associated with the County Noise Ordinance standards exceedance at the eastern residential property line to a level less than significant.

N1. During construction of the project and prior to any occupancy or use of the premises pursuant to this site plan, the project applicant shall construct a 19-foot high screen wall located along the eastern side of the loading dock area as identified in Figure 2-7 of this EIR.

Mitigation Measure N1 shall be subject to monitoring by the County of San Diego Department of Planning and Land Use (DPLU) and shall be completed to the satisfaction of the County of San Diego DPLU (FEIR, 2-63).

The construction of a 19-foot high screen wall along the eastern side of the loading dock area will reduce noise levels at the eastern residential property line to a level less than significant per County Noise Ordinance standards.

The Reduced Transportation/Circulation alternative, Residential Development alternative, Alternative Location – Shaw Property, and Reduced Project - No Supermarket alternative would result in slightly lower noise levels than the proposed project. Please refer to Section XII. Feasibility of Project Alternatives for a more detailed comparison of the proposed project and these alternative, as well as a discussion of the feasibility of these alternatives. However, upon operation, noise impacts would be required to be mitigated to similar levels under either the proposed project or any of these alternatives.

Significant Impact C-2:

If two trucks idle or two refrigerated units operate for 30-minutes each during a one-hour time period in the loading dock area, the one-hour average sound level would be approximately 64 dB at the adjacent undeveloped property located east of the site. This noise level would exceed the County's daytime Noise Ordinance limits by 9 dB and nighttime by 14 dB. This is considered a significant impact (FEIR, 2-55).

Finding:

Pursuant to CEQA Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the FEIR.

Rationale:

Implementation of Mitigation Measure N2 will reduce the impact associated with exceedance of County's Noise Ordinance limits at the adjacent undeveloped property located east of the project site.

N2. During construction of the project and prior to any occupancy or use of the premises pursuant to this site plan, the project applicant shall construct a four-to six-foot high barrier along the top slope of the eastern edge of the boundary as identified in Figure 2-7 of this EIR.

Mitigation Measure N2 shall be subject to monitoring by the County of San Diego Department of Planning and Land Use (DPLU) and shall be completed to the satisfaction of the County of San Diego DPLU (FEIR-2-63).

The construction of a four-to six-foot high barrier along the top slope of the eastern edge of the boundary would reduce the noise level to a level less than significant per the County's Noise Ordinance standards.

The Reduced Transportation/Circulation alternative, Residential Development alternative, Alternative Location – Shaw Property, and Reduced Project - No Supermarket alternative would result in slightly lower noise levels than the proposed project. Please refer to Section XII. Feasibility of Project Alternatives for a more detailed comparison of the proposed project and these alternative, as well as a discussion of the feasibility of these alternatives. However, upon operation, noise impacts would be required to be mitigated to similar levels under either the proposed project or any of these alternatives.

Significant Impact C-3:

The proposed Project's parking lot cleaning activities would exceed the County's Noise Ordinance limits by seven dB during the nighttime hours and two dB during the daytime hours. This is considered a significant impact (FEIR, 2-59).

Finding:

Pursuant to CEQA Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the FEIR.

Rationale:

Implementation of Mitigation Measure N3 will reduce the noise impact associated with cleaning activities to a level less than significant.

N3. Power blowers shall not be used by anyone at any time on the project site.

Mitigation Measure N3 shall be subject to monitoring by the County of San Diego Department of Planning and Land Use (DPLU) and shall be completed to the satisfaction of the County of San Diego DPLU (FEIR, 2-63).

Requiring that no power blowers be used on the project site will ensure that parking lot cleaning activities will have a noise level of approximately 46 dB at the property line closest to the residences west of the project site. This is well within the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance daytime and nighttime standards, resulting in a less than significant impact.

The Reduced Transportation/Circulation alternative, Residential Development alternative, Alternative Location – Shaw Property, and Reduced Project - No Supermarket alternative would result in slightly lower noise levels than the proposed project. Please refer to Section XII. Feasibility of Project Alternatives for a more detailed comparison of the proposed project and these alternative, as well as a discussion of the feasibility of these alternatives. However, upon operation, noise impacts would be required to be mitigated to similar levels under either the proposed project or any of these alternatives.

Significant Impact C-4:

Due to the operation of rooftop mechanical equipment on the fast-food restaurant, the noise level outside the second floor of the homes would be approximately 51 dB. This noise level would exceed the County's nighttime noise criteria by one dB. This is considered a significant impact (FEIR, 2-61).

Finding:

Pursuant to CEQA Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the FEIR.

Rationale:

Implementation of Mitigation Measure N4 will reduce the noise impact associated with rooftop mechanical equipment on the fast-food restaurant to a level less than significant.

N4. At the time mechanical equipment plans are prepared for the fast food restaurant and prior to any occupancy or use of the premises pursuant to this site plan, the

plans shall be reviewed by the County of San Diego Department of Planning and Land Use to ensure that the noise levels will not exceed the County's Noise Ordinance limits. Should the rooftop mechanical equipment exceed County of San Diego Noise Ordinance limits, a minimum six-foot high parapet shall be constructed along the west, north and south sides of the roof to reduce the noise level to within County of San Diego Noise Ordinance daytime and nighttime standards.

Mitigation Measure N4 shall be subject to monitoring by the County of San Diego Department of Planning and Land Use (DPLU) and shall be completed to the satisfaction of the County of San Diego DPLU (FEIR, 2-63).

Should the fast food restaurant rooftop mechanical equipment exceed County of San Diego Noise Ordinance limits even with implementation of Mitigation Measure N4, a minimum six-foot high parapet shall be constructed along the west, north, and south sides of the roof to reduce the noise impact to a level less than significant per the County Noise Ordinance standards.

The Reduced Transportation/Circulation alternative, Residential Development alternative, Alternative Location – Shaw Property, and Reduced Project – No Supermarket alternative would result in slightly lower noise levels than the proposed project. Please refer to Section XII. Feasibility of Project Alternatives for a more detailed comparison of the proposed project and these alternative, as well as a discussion of the feasibility of these alternatives. However, upon operation, noise impacts would be required to be mitigated to similar levels under either the proposed project or any of these alternatives.

D. Drainage/Hydrology

Significant Impact D-1:

Implementation of the proposed Project could result in a significant short-term drainage/hydrology impact associated with construction of the project site (FEIR, 2-71).

Finding:

Pursuant to CEQA Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the FEIR.

Rationale:

Implementation of Mitigation Measure DH1 will reduce the short-term drainage/hydrology impact associated with construction of the project site to a level less than significant.

DH1. Prior to obtaining any building or other permit pursuant to this site plan, and prior to commencement of construction or use of the property in reliance on this site plan, the project proponent shall prepare and implement a plan to direct runoff to gravel bags and sediment basins on-site. During construction of the project, a gravel entrance/exit to the site shall be maintained to avoid mud being tracked onto adjoining streets, and dust shall be controlled by water trucks. Implementation of this mitigation measure is subject to the monitoring and approval of the County of San Diego Department of Public Works (FEIR, 2-77).

No alternative would reduce drainage/hydrology impacts associated with the proposed project.

E. Biological Resources

Significant Impact E-1:

Removal of the 4.28 acres of coastal sage scrub on-site is considered a significant impact (FEIR, 2-90).

Finding:

Pursuant to CEQA Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the FEIR.

Rationale:

Because 0.8 acre of coastal sage scrub was previously acquired on a mitigation site that meets core criteria, there is a surplus of 0.29 acre (0.8 minus 0.51). This surplus 0.29 acre of Tier II habitat can be applied toward mitigation for impacts to the remaining Tier II habitat (coastal sage-chaparral scrub) that is located on-site. Since 0.29 acre of mitigation credit can be applied to the 4.28-acre requirement, a remaining 3.99 acres of mitigation acreage at the Tier II level must be acquired. (FEIR, 2-90 through 2-91)

Implementation of Mitigation Measure BR1 will reduce the impact to the removal of coastal sage scrub to a level less than significant.

BR1. Prior to obtaining any building or other permit pursuant to this site plan, and prior to commencement of construction or use of the property in reliance on this site plan, implementation of improvement plans or finalizing the map, the project applicant shall provide for the approval of the Director of the Department of Planning and Land Use (DPLU) the following:

- i. Evidence that 3.99 acres of coastal sage scrub habitat credit has been secured in a County approved mitigation bank located within the boundaries of the County's Multiple Species Conservation Program

(MSCP).

- ii. An accounting of the status of the mitigation bank. This shall include the total amount of credits available at the bank, the amount required by the proposed project and the amount remaining after utilization by this project. The account status shall also identify the entity responsible for the maintenance and management of this bank and must include information regarding how the land will be protected in perpetuity (FEIR, 2-92).

Evidence that 3.99 acres of coastal sage scrub habitat credit has been secured in a County approved mitigation bank located within the boundaries of the County's Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) will reduce the impact associated with clearing of 4.28 acres of coastal sage scrub habitat on-site to a level less than significant. The impacts to coastal sage scrub have been assessed pursuant to MSCP, the County's comprehensive, long-term habitat conservation program, which addresses the needs of multiple species and preservation of natural vegetation communities in San Diego County and the implementing Biological Mitigation Ordinance (BMO). MSCP addresses the potential impacts of urban growth, natural habitat loss and species endangerment and creates a plan to mitigate for the potential loss of species and their habitat due to impacts from future development of private and public lands within the MSCP area. MSCP is a subregional plan under the Natural Communities Conservation Program, which will be implemented through local subarea plans. The County subarea plan was adopted by the County Board of Supervisors to achieve regional biological conservation goals. The impacts to coastal sage scrub have been quantified on a Tier basis pursuant to BMO. BMO protects biological resources in the County through establishing criteria for: avoidance of impacts to biological resource core areas; avoidance of impacts to animals and plants with biological resource core areas; and mitigation requirements for projects requiring a discretionary permit from the County. Conforming to MSCP's planning goals and the BMO's mitigation requirements reduces all impacts to level less than significant.

No alternative would reduce biological resources impacts associated with the proposed project.

Significant Impact E-2:

The proposed Project will remove 2.24 acres of southern mixed chaparral. This is considered a significant impact (FEIR, 2-91).

Finding:

Pursuant to CEQA Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the FEIR.

Rationale:

According to the Biological Mitigation Ordinance (BMO), impacts to southern mixed chaparral must be mitigated by the purchase of southern mixed chaparral or other Tier III or higher habitat credits in a mitigation bank at a 0.5:1 ratio. (FEIR, 2-91)

Implementation of Mitigation Measure BR2 will reduce the impact associated with removal of 2.24 acres of southern mixed chaparral to a level less than significant.

BR2. Prior to obtaining any building or other permit pursuant to this site plan, and prior to commencement of construction or use of the property in reliance on this site plan, implementation of improvement plans or finalizing the map, the project applicant shall provide for the approval of the Director of DPLU the following:

- i. Evidence that 1.12 acres of southern mixed chaparral or other Tier III or higher habitat credit has been secured in a County of San Diego approved mitigation bank located within the boundaries of the County's MSCP.
- ii. An accounting of the status of the mitigation bank. This shall include the total amount of credits available at the bank, the amount required by the proposed project, and the amount remaining after utilization by the project. The account status shall also identify the entity responsible for the maintenance and management of this bank and must include information regarding how the land will be protected in perpetuity (FEIR, 2-93).

Evidence that 1.12 acres of southern mixed chaparral of other Tier III or higher habitat credit has been secured in a County approved mitigation bank located within the boundaries of the County's Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) will reduce the impact associated with removal of 2.24 acres of southern mixed chaparral to a level less than significant. The impacts to southern mixed chaparral have been assessed pursuant to MSCP, the County's comprehensive, long-term habitat conservation program, which addresses the needs of multiple species and preservation of natural vegetation communities in San Diego County and the implementing Biological Mitigation Ordinance (BMO). MSCP addresses the potential impacts of urban growth, natural habitat loss and species endangerment and creates a plan to mitigate for the potential loss of species and their habitat due to impacts from future development of private and public lands within the MSCP area. MSCP is a subregional plan under the Natural Communities Conservation Program, which will be implemented through local subarea plans. The County subarea plan was adopted by the County Board of Supervisors to achieve regional biological conservation goals. The impacts to southern mixed chaparral have been quantified on a Tier basis pursuant to BMO. BMO protects biological resources in the County through establishing criteria for: avoidance of impacts to biological resource core areas; avoidance of impacts to animals and plants with biological resource core areas; and mitigation requirements for projects requiring a discretionary permit from the County. Conforming to MSCP's planning goals and the BMO's mitigation requirements reduces all impacts to level less than significant.

No alternative would reduce biological resources impacts associated with the proposed project.

X. CUMULATIVE IMPACTS DETERMINED TO BE SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE

- No cumulative significant unavoidable impact was identified in the FEIR.

XI. CUMULATIVE IMPACTS DETERMINED TO BE SIGNIFICANT AND MITIGABLE

A. Transportation/Circulation

Cumulatively Significant Impact A-1:

Because the proposed Project contributes to the delay at these intersections: 1. Tavern Road/Arnold Way; 2. Alpine Boulevard/West Victoria Drive; 3. Tavern Road/I-8 westbound ramp; and 4. Tavern Road/I-8 eastbound ramp, this is considered a cumulatively significant impact (FEIR, 3-4).

Finding:

Pursuant to CEQA Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the FEIR.

Rationale:

Implementation of Mitigation Measures TC1 through TC3 will reduce the impact to Tavern Road/Arnold Way, Alpine Boulevard/West Victoria Drive, Tavern Road/I-8 westbound ramp, and Tavern Road/I-8 eastbound ramp to a level less than significant in the Existing + Project + Other projects conditions.

- TC1. Prior to obtaining any building or other permit pursuant to this site plan, and prior to commencement of construction or use of the property in reliance on this site plan, the applicant shall pay a "fair share" contribution as determined by the County of San Diego Public Works Department based on Caltrans estimates for the signalization of the Tavern Road/Interstate 8 eastbound and westbound ramp intersections. That contribution would be approximately \$4,539 for the westbound ramp and \$8,170 for the eastbound ramp for a total of \$12,709. The applicant must also pay approximately \$9,267 for the construction of street and ramp facilities, such as pavements, realignments of horizontal and vertical curves,

storm drains, grading, etc. for the Interstate 8 eastbound ramp/Tavern Road intersection. Thus, the grand fair share total due for Mitigation Measure TC1 is approximately \$21,976. Proof of payment of this fair share contribution must be made to the Director of DPW prior to any occupancy or use of the premises pursuant to this site plan.

- TC2. Prior to obtaining any building or other permit pursuant to this site plan, and prior to commencement of construction or use of the property in reliance on this site plan, the applicant shall pay a “fair share” contribution as determined by the County of San Diego Public Works Department under the County of San Diego Traffic Signal Participation Fee Program toward the signalization of the Tavern Road/Arnold Way intersection. That contribution will be approximately \$8,715. Proof of payment of this fair share contribution must be made to the Director of DPW prior to any occupancy or use of the premises pursuant to this site plan.
- TC3. Prior to any occupancy or use of the premises pursuant to this site plan, the applicant shall design and construct a traffic signal at the Alpine Boulevard/West Victoria Drive/Arnold Way intersection. The design and construction of this signal shall be subject to review by the County of San Diego Department of Public Works (DPW) and completed to the satisfaction of the Director of DPW prior to any occupancy or use of the premises pursuant to this site plan (FEIR, 3-12).

Signalization of the Alpine Boulevard/West Victoria Drive/Arnold Way intersection and payment of fair share contributions for the signalization of the Tavern Road/I-8 ramps interchange and the Tavern Road/Arnold Way intersection, would allow these intersections to operate at LOS C or better in the Existing + Project + Other Projects (i.e., cumulative) condition, which is an acceptable LOS under County standards.

The Reduced Transportation/Circulation Impact Alternative, Residential Development, Reduced Project No Gas Station, Reduced Project – No Supermarket, Reduced Supermarket Facility, and No Gas Station – Small Retail Shop Building alternatives would reduce transportation impacts to these intersections; however, as described in more detail in Section XII. Feasibility of Project Alternatives, none of these alternatives would reduce this impact to a level less than significant.

Cumulatively Significant Impact A-2:

Cumulative trip generation associated with the proposed Project and other cumulative projects may cumulatively result in intermittent delays along Alpine Boulevard between West Victoria Drive and Bay Meadows. This is considered a significant impact (FEIR, 3-7).

Finding:

Pursuant to CEQA Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the FEIR.

Rationale:

Implementation of Mitigation Measure TC4 will reduce the impact along Alpine Boulevard between West Victoria Drive and Bay Meadows to a level less than significant.

TC4. Prior to any occupancy or use of the premises pursuant to this site plan, the applicant shall design and improve Alpine Boulevard to three-lane Town Collector Road standards from West Victoria Drive to a point approximately 100 feet east of Marshall Road (See Figure 2-4). This improvement shall be subject to the review of the Department of Public Works (DPW) and shall be completed to the satisfaction of the Director of DPW prior to any occupancy or use of the premises pursuant to this site plan (FEIR, 3-12).

Requiring the Project proponent to improve the roadway segment from West Victoria Drive to 100 feet east of Marshall to three-lane Town Collector Road standards will allow this roadway segment to operate at LOS D or better in the Existing + Project + Other Projects (i.e., cumulative) condition, which is an acceptable LOS under County standards.

The Reduced Transportation/Circulation Impact Alternative, Residential Development, Reduced Project No Gas Station, Reduced Project – No Supermarket, Reduced Supermarket Facility, and No Gas Station – Small Retail Shop Building alternatives would reduce transportation impacts to this roadway segment; however, as described in more detail in Section XII. Feasibility of Project Alternatives, none of these alternatives would reduce this impact to a level less than significant.

XII. FEASIBILITY OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Because the Project will cause unavoidable significant environmental effects, as outlined in Section VIII of these Findings, the County must consider the feasibility of any environmentally superior alternative to the Project, as finally approved. The County must evaluate whether one or more of these alternatives could avoid or substantially lessen the unavoidable significant environmental effects. Citizens for Quality Growth v. City of Mount Shasta, 198 California. App. 3d 433, 243 California. Rptr. 727 (1988); see also Pub. Res. Code § 21002. Because it is a judgment call whether an alternative is environmentally superior, these Findings contrast and compare all of the alternatives analyzed in the Final EIR with the Project.

In general, in preparing and adopting findings, a lead agency need not necessarily address the feasibility of both mitigation measures and environmentally superior alternatives when contemplating the approval of a project with significant impacts. Where the significant impacts can be mitigated to an acceptable (insignificant) level solely by the adoption of mitigation measures, the agency, in drafting its findings, has no obligation to consider the feasibility of environmentally superior alternatives, even if their impacts would be less severe than those of the Project as mitigated. Laurel Heights Improvement Ass'n v. Regents of the University of California, 47 California. 3d 376, 253 California.

Rptr. 426 (1988); Laurel Hills Homeowners Ass'n v. City Council, 83 California. App. 3d 515, 147 California. Rptr. 842 (1978); see also Kings County Farm Bureau v. City of Hanford, 221 California. App. 3d 692, 270 California. Rptr. 650 (1990). Accordingly, for this Project, in adopting the findings concerning Project alternatives, the decision-making body considers only those environmental impacts that for the finally approved Project are significant and cannot be avoided or substantially lessened through mitigation.

The Project would have a significant, unavoidable adverse environmental impact with respect to the following:

- Short-term (0.5 to 3.5 years) traffic/circulation impacts to the Tavern Road/Interstate 8 interchange associated with the addition of 5 AM and 7 PM westbound trips to this intersection during the course of the AM and PM peak hours, respectively, and 12 AM and 13 PM eastbound trips to this intersection during the course of the AM and PM peak hours, respectively, and
- Short-term (potentially 4.0 years) traffic/circulation impacts to the Tavern Road/Arnold Way intersection associated with 54 AM and 57 PM trips added to this intersection during the course of the AM and PM peak hours, respectively.

Where significant environmental effects remain even after application of all feasible mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR, the decision makers must evaluate the Project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. Under these circumstances, CEQA requires findings on the feasibility of Project alternatives. If no Project alternatives are feasible, the decision makers must adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations with regard to the Project. If there is a feasible alternative to the Project, the decision makers must decide whether it is environmentally superior to the Project. Proposed Project alternatives considered must be ones which “could feasibly attain the basic objectives of the Project.” However, the Guidelines also require an EIR to examine alternatives “capable of eliminating” environmental effects even if these alternatives “would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives.” CEQA Guidelines § 15126(d).

CEQA provides the following definition of the term “feasible,” as it applies to the findings requirement: “‘Feasible’ means capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social and technological factors.” Pub. Res. Code § 21061.1.

Accordingly, “feasibility” is a term of art under CEQA and thus is afforded a different meaning as may be provided by a dictionary or other source. Moreover, CEQA Section 21081 governs the “findings” requirement under CEQA with regard to the feasibility of alternatives and states, in pertinent part, that:

... no public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an environmental impact report has been certified which identifies one or more significant effects on the environment that would occur if the Project is approved or carried out unless the public agency makes one or more of the following

findings: (a)(3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the environmental impact report.

The concept of “feasibility,” therefore, as it applies to findings, involves a balancing of various economic, environmental, social, legal and technological factors. See Pub. Res. Code § 21061.1; CEQA Guidelines § 15364; Pub. Res. Code § 21081; see also City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego, 133 California. App. 3d 401, 414-417 (1992).

In City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego, 133 California. App. 3d 401, 415-417 (1992), the Court found that the City of San Diego had “. . . considered and reasonably rejected . . . [certain] project alternatives . . . as infeasible in view of the social and economic realities in the region.” *Id.* at 417. The court determined that the City of San Diego had attempted to accommodate the feasibility factors based on its growth management plan, which included the proposed development project. Accordingly, the Court concluded:

Assuming this accommodation is a reasonable one (citation omitted), San Diego is entitled to rely on it in evaluating various project alternatives. The cost-benefit analysis which led to the accommodation is of course subject to review, but it need not be mechanically stated at each stage of the approval process. In this sense, “feasibility” under CEQA encompasses “desirability” to the extent that desirability is based on a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, environmental, social, and technological factors. We accordingly conclude that San Diego did not abuse its discretion under CEQA in rejecting the various project alternatives as infeasible.

***Id.* These Findings contrast and compare the alternatives where appropriate in order to demonstrate that the selection of the No Gas Station – Small Retail Shop alternative, while still resulting in significant environmental impacts, has substantial environmental, planning, fiscal and other benefits. In rejecting the applicant-preferred project and the other alternatives analyzed within the EIR, the County has examined the Project objectives and weighed the ability of the various alternatives to meet the objectives. The decision makers believe that the No Gas Station – Small Retail Shop Building alternative best meets the Project objectives with the least environmental impact.** The primary objectives proposed by the applicant at the outset of the project and considered by the decision makers are:

- To implement the County’s General Plan, zoning, Alpine Highlands Specific Plan and Alpine Community Plan with respect to the project site.
- To provide a modern, state-of-the-art, neighborhood shopping center anchored by a full-sized major supermarket-drugstore offering a wide variety of goods and services at a variety of price points, with a gasoline service station, a fast service restaurant and local-serving shops in an area where such services are generally not available.

- To provide a neighborhood shopping center on the same side of Interstate 8 as the majority of the residential population of Alpine.
- To provide a neighborhood shopping center within walking or bicycling distance of as many residents as feasible.
- To provide convenient shopping for the existing resident population of Alpine and points east of the community, which will reduce drive time to comparably anchored shopping centers located further away.
- To place a neighborhood shopping center in a location that has strong demographic support and optimal chance for success based upon criteria used by Albertsons.
- To provide a nationally known major anchor tenant that is typically visited by customers two to three times a week, which will ensure the economic vitality of local serving businesses in the Project by drawing customers to the project site.
- To attain traffic and economic efficiency by encouraging a single, full-service anchor store to occupy the site, rather than several smaller stores.

The Final EIR for the Project examined a broad range of reasonable alternatives to the Project to determine whether Project objectives could be met while avoiding or substantially lessening one or more of the Project's significant unavoidable impacts. To that end, and as set forth below, the County has properly considered and reasonably rejected the proposed Project analyzed throughout the EIR and the following Project alternatives as infeasible pursuant to CEQA. ***The County has determined that the No Gas Station – Small Retail Shop Building alternative is a feasible project that meets most of the originally identified project objectives. Although the No Gas Station – Small Retail Shop Building alternative does not provide a gas station, which is a component of the original project objectives, the County of San Diego has determined that this alternative meets most of the basic project objectives while reducing impacts. Therefore, the No Gas Station – Small Retail Shop Building alternative is not rejected, but is the project ultimately approved by the County.***

A. REDUCED PROJECT - REDUCED TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION IMPACT ALTERNATIVE

This alternative was considered due to its potential to reduce the significant transportation/circulation impacts associated with the proposed Project. Based on daily traffic generation, a maximum Project trip generation of 1,080 average daily trips (ADT) could be generated without significantly impacting any of the roadway segments that are impacted by the proposed Project. In order to limit the Project trip generation to 1,080 ADT, the Project would have to be reduced to one of the following options:

- 9,000 square feet of commercial uses with no fast food restaurant or gas station;
- A 1,500 square foot fast food restaurant; or
- A gas station with six fueling stations.

1. **Project Related Impacts:** This alternative is capable of: reducing transportation/circulation impacts to the roadway segments impacted by the proposed Project; resulting in shorter delays at the intersections impacted by the Project; and reducing noise impacts associated with the proposed commercial uses of the site. However, this alternative does not avoid nor reduce to a level less than significant the significant impacts to the intersections impacted by the proposed Project because the intersections impacted by the proposed Project are operating at LOS E or F under existing conditions, and any additional traffic (e.g., one trip at) added to these intersections would result in a significant increase in delay (2 seconds or more) at these intersections.
2. **Other Impacts Associated with the Reduced Project - Reduced Transportation/Circulation Impact Alternative:** This alternative would not create any new significant impacts associated with the proposed Project.
3. **Project Objectives:** This alternative fails to meet most of the basic objectives of the proposed Project because this alternative would not:
 - Provide a modern, state-of-the-art, neighborhood shopping center anchored by a full sized major supermarket-drugstore offering a wide variety of goods and services at a variety of price points, with a gasoline service station, a fast service restaurant and local-serving shops in an area where such services are generally not available.
 - Provide a neighborhood shopping center on the same side of Interstate 8 as the majority of the residential population of Alpine.
 - Provide a neighborhood shopping center within walking or bicycling distance of as many residents as feasible.
 - Provide convenient shopping for the existing resident population of Alpine and points east of the community, which will reduce drive time to comparably anchored shopping centers located further away.
 - Place a neighborhood shopping center in a location that has strong demographic support and optimal chance for success based upon criteria used by Albertsons and a study prepared by Retail Research Group.
 - Provide a nationally known major anchor tenant that is typically visited by customers two to three times a week, which will ensure the economic vitality of local serving businesses by drawing customers to the project site.
 - Attain traffic and economic efficiency by encouraging a single, full-service anchor store to occupy the site, rather than several smaller stores.

4. **Conclusion:** This alternative is rejected as infeasible because: a) it does not reduce to a level less than significant the significant and unavoidable short-term traffic/circulation impacts associated with the proposed Project; b) it does not meet most of the basic Project objectives; and c) it is not an economically feasible use of the project site because a reasonable return could not be generated on the land cost and grading and infrastructure costs necessary to buy the site and prepare the site for development.

B. RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROJECT SITE

This alternative was considered due to its potential to avoid the air quality impact associated with the proposed fast-service restaurant and the noise impacts associated with the proposed commercial uses. This alternative assumes development of the site with residential uses at a density commensurate with surrounding residential land uses (approximately four dwelling units per acre). Under this alternative, the undevelopable 1.2 acre of land in the southern portion of the project site would remain undeveloped. This alternative assumes development of the remaining 8.4 acres of the site with 33 residential units. This alternative would reduce trips generated from the project site to approximately 330 average daily trips.

1. **Project Related Impacts:** Although this alternative is capable of reducing the transportation/circulation delays and impacts associated with the proposed Project, and the noise and air quality impacts associated with the proposed Project, it does not avoid nor reduce to a level less than significant the significant impacts to the intersections impacted by the proposed Project because the intersections impacted by the proposed Project are operating at LOS E or F under existing conditions, and any additional traffic (e.g., one trip) added to these intersections would result in a significant increase in delay (2 seconds or more) at these intersections.
2. **Other Impacts Associated with the Residential Development of the Project Site Alternative:** This alternative would not create any new significant impacts associated with the proposed Project.
3. **Project Objectives:** It fails to meet all of the basic objectives of the proposed Project because this alternative would not:
 - Implement the County's General Plan, zoning, Alpine Highlands Specific Plan and Alpine Community Plan with respect to the project site.
 - Provide a modern, state-of-the-art, neighborhood shopping center anchored by a full-sized major supermarket-drugstore offering a wide variety of goods and services at a variety of price points, with a gasoline service station, a fast service restaurant and local-serving shops in an area where such services are generally not available.
 - Provide a neighborhood shopping center on the same side of Interstate 8 as the majority of the residential population of Alpine.

- Provide a neighborhood shopping center within walking or bicycling distance of as many residents as feasible.
- Provide convenient shopping for the existing resident population of Alpine and points east of the community, which will reduce drive time to comparably anchored shopping centers located further away.
- Place a neighborhood shopping center in a location that has strong demographic support and optimal chance for success based upon criteria used by Albertsons and a study prepared by Retail Research Group.
- Provide a nationally known major anchor tenant that is typically visited by customers two to three times a week, which will ensure the economic vitality of local serving businesses by drawing customers to the project site.
- Attain traffic and economic efficiency by encouraging a single, full-service anchor store to occupy the site, rather than several smaller stores.

4. **Conclusion:** This alternative is rejected as infeasible because: a) it does not reduce to a level less than significant the significant and unavoidable short-term traffic/circulation impacts associated with the proposed Project; b) it does not meet most of the basic Project objectives; c) it is inconsistent with both the existing General Plan designation, which assumes a neighborhood retail shopping center as part of the Alpine Highlands Specific Plan and the zoning (C36 General Commercial) for the site; and d) it is inconsistent with community plan goals as described in detail in Section 2.6.1.3 of the FEIR.

C. NO PROJECT/EXISTING GENERAL PLAN ALTERNATIVE

This alternative is analyzed as it is a required under CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e). According to Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines, the “no project” analysis shall discuss, “. . . what is reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services.” Section 15126.6(e)(3)(B) adds that, “(i)f disapproval of the project under consideration would result in predictable actions by others, such as the proposal of some other project, this ‘no project’ consequence should be discussed.”

This alternative assumes that the project site would not be developed with the proposed Project but would be developed in the future according to the existing General Plan designation of the site. The project site would be developed consistent with the Regional Land Use Element Policy 2.6 Special Purpose and General Plan Land Use Designation (21) within the adopted Specific Plan for the Site. The site is within the adopted Alpine Highlands Specific Plan, which provides for commercial use of the site compatible with its underlying C36 General Commercial zoning. More specifically, this alternative assumes that if the proposed Project were not approved, another developer/anchor would propose a similar commercial development on the project site in the foreseeable future.

1. **Project Related Impacts:** This alternative is environmentally similar to the proposed Project and it does not reduce nor avoid any significant environmental impact associated with the proposed Project.
2. **Other Impacts Associated with the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative:** This alternative would not create any new significant impacts associated with the proposed Project.
3. **Project Objectives:** Although this alternative would likely result in commercial development of the project site in the future, the existing demographic and market demands for the proposed shopping center uses would remain unmet for an unspecified period of time. Also, although this Project would likely result in the development of commercial uses on the site in the foreseeable future, future proposed commercial uses will not necessarily include a major tenant supermarket as an anchor. Because future proposals may not include a nationally known major anchor tenant that is typically visited by customers two to three times a week, this alternative may not meet the Project objectives of: a) providing a use that ensures the economic vitality of local serving businesses by drawing customers to the project site; b) providing a modern, state-of-the-art, neighborhood shopping center anchored by a full-size, major supermarket-drugstore offering a wide variety of goods and services at a variety of price points, with a gasoline service station, a fast service restaurant and local-serving shops in an area where such services are generally not available; or c) reducing drive time to comparably anchored shopping centers located further away. The remaining Project objectives would likely be met under this alternative.
4. **Conclusion:** This alternative is rejected as infeasible because: a) it does not reduce to a level less than significant the significant and unavoidable short-term traffic/circulation impacts associated with the proposed Project; b) it does not meet many of the Project objectives; and c) development would not occur as proposed and the existing demographic and market demands (as identified by Retail Research Group) for this shopping center would remain unmet for an unspecified period of time.

D. ALTERNATIVE LOCATION – SHAW PROPERTY

This alternative is analyzed in response to comments received on the NOP and previously circulated MND. These comments recommended that this alternative location be analyzed due to its potential to reduce land use compatibility and traffic impacts associated with the proposed Project.

This alternative assumes the proposed Project would be developed on the Shaw property, and the proposed project site would remain in its existing condition in the immediate future. The Shaw property is located on Tavern Road north of the Interstate 8. This alternative assumes a similar development footprint as the proposed Project, with a supermarket, retail pads, gas station/mini-mart, and fast-food restaurant with drive-thru,

although this site is larger and could be developed with considerably more square footage than the proposed site plan. ***Like the proposed Project analyzed in detail throughout the EIR, this alternative assumed a gas station would be provided. Replacement of this gas station with a 5,000 square foot retail shop as is proposed with the No Gas Station – Small Retail Shop Building alternative, would also reduce trips to this alternative site by approximately 680 trips. This reduction in trips would also lessen traffic, noise, and air quality impacts to a degree under this alternative; however, no change to the following conclusions would occur.***

1. **Project Related Impacts:** The Alternative Location – Shaw Property is not environmentally superior to the proposed project because it results in substantially greater transportation/circulation impacts at the Tavern Road/Interstate 8 interchanges, requiring substantially increased mitigation than the proposed project. Under this alternative, the I-8 ramps at Tavern Road interchange and the intersection of Tavern Road at Arnold Way would be significantly impacted; these intersections and associated roadway segments would experience substantially greater delays than would occur with the proposed Project at the proposed project site. Mitigation of the Tavern Road/I-8 interchange would require that the Tavern Road overcrossing be widened to its ultimate configuration of a Major Road with appropriate turn lanes (equivalent of a six-lane roadway). Both the I-8 eastbound and westbound ramps would also require signalization and possible widening. Although this alternative would result in less noise impacts than the proposed project, the overall level of impact at this location is not superior to the proposed project as the proposed project's noise impacts can be mitigated to a level less than significant. This alternative will not avoid any of the significant impacts identified for the proposed Project.
2. **Other Impacts Associated with the Alternative Location – Shaw Property:** This alternative would not create any new significant impacts associated with the proposed Project.
3. **Project Objectives:** Development of the proposed project at the Shaw property would not meet the project objectives of: a) implementing the County's General Plan, zoning, *Alpine Highlands Specific Plan* and *Alpine Community Plan* with respect to the project site (nor would it implement the existing land use and zoning regulations of the Shaw property); b) providing a neighborhood shopping center on the same side of Interstate 8 as the majority of the residential population of Alpine; or c) providing a neighborhood shopping center within walking or bicycling distance of as many residents as feasible. The remaining project objectives would likely be met under this alternative.
4. **Conclusion:** This alternative is rejected as infeasible because: a) it does not reduce to a level less than significant the significant and unavoidable short-term traffic/circulation impacts associated with the proposed Project; and b) it does not meet many of the Project objectives.

E. ALTERNATIVE LOCATION – DYKE PROPERTY

This alternative is analyzed in response to comments received on the NOP and previously circulated MND. These comments recommended that this alternative location be analyzed due to its potential to reduce land use incompatibility and traffic impacts associated with the proposed Project.

Even though an application has been submitted by the Haagen Company to the County of San Diego Department of Planning and Land Use for development of this site with a commercial project that is almost twice the size of the proposed project, this alternative assumes the proposed Project (72,275 square feet of development) would be developed on the Dyke property, and the proposed project site would remain in its existing condition in the immediate future. The Dyke property is located on Tavern Road north of the Interstate 8. This alternative assumes a similar development footprint as the proposed Project, with a supermarket, retail pads, gas station/mini-mart, and fast-food restaurant with drive-thru, although as indicated by the project currently submitted to the County for the Dyke property, this site is larger and could be developed with considerably more square footage than the proposed site plan. *Like the proposed Project analyzed in detail throughout the EIR, this alternative assumed a gas station would be provided. Replacement of this gas station with 5,000 square foot retail shop as is proposed with the No Gas Station – Small Retail Shop Building alternative, would also reduce trips to this alternative site by approximately 680 trips. This reduction in trips would also lessen traffic, noise, and air quality impacts to a degree under this alternative; however, no change to the following conclusions would occur.*

1. **Project Related Impacts:** The Alternative Location – Dyke Property is not environmentally superior to the proposed project because it results in substantially greater impact on biological resources and substantially greater transportation/circulation impacts at the Tavern Road/Interstate 8 interchanges, requiring substantially increased mitigation than the proposed project. This alternative is environmentally inferior to the proposed project.
2. **Other Impacts Associated with the Alternative Location – Dyke Property:** This alternative would not create any new significant impacts associated with the proposed Project.
3. **Project Objectives:** Development of the proposed project at the Dyke property would not meet the project objectives of: a) implementing the County's General Plan, zoning, Alpine Highlands Specific Plan and Alpine Community Plan with respect to the project site (nor would it implement the existing land use and zoning regulations of the Dyke property); b) providing a neighborhood shopping center on the same side of Interstate 8 as the majority of the residential population of Alpine; or c) providing a neighborhood shopping center within walking or bicycling distance of as many residents as feasible. The remaining project objectives would likely be met under this alternative.

4. **Conclusion:** This alternative is rejected as infeasible because: a) it does not reduce to a level less than significant the significant and unavoidable short-term traffic/circulation impacts associated with the proposed Project; and b) it does not meet many of the Project objectives.

F. REDUCED PROJECT – NO GAS STATION

This alternative was analyzed due to its potential to reduce significant transportation/circulation impacts and potentially significant drainage impacts of the proposed project. This alternative assumes development of the proposed project site with the proposed supermarket, fast service restaurant and retail shops, and a smaller retail shop building in place of the gas station. This alternative would allow for the construction of a surface detention basin on-site, if required under the permit of the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (SDRWQCB) during review of the project. The surface detention basin, if built, would be constructed at street grade and would be a natural vegetated area in accordance with SDRWQCB requirements. The detention basin would require approximately 8,700 square feet of graded area, with a water surface area of approximately 5,900 square feet. This surface detention basin would be located in the northwest corner of the project site, near the intersection of Alpine Boulevard and South Grade Road, eliminating the parking spaces in this area. Replacement parking spaces would be created where the gas pump islands are presently shown on the proposed site plan. Because the gas pumps would be eliminated, this alternative would reduce average daily vehicle trips to the site by a net of 1,037 trips.

1. **Project Related Impacts:** The minimal reduction in traffic generation would result in shorter delays at the Tavern Road/I-8 interchange ramps, Tavern Road/Arnold Way intersection, and Alpine Boulevard/West Victoria Drive/Arnold Way intersections than would occur with the proposed project. However, it does not reduce to a level less than significant the significant and unavoidable short-term traffic/circulation impacts associated with the proposed Project. This alternative will also result in fewer localized air emissions than the proposed Project. This alternative is environmentally superior to the proposed Project.
2. **Other Impacts Associated with the Reduced Project – No Gas Station:** This alternative would not create any new significant impacts associated with the proposed Project.
3. **Project Objectives:** Development of the Reduced Project Alternative would implement most of the basic project objectives, except a gas station use would not be provided.
4. **Conclusion:** Because this alternative meets most of the basic objectives of the proposed project; results in shorter transportation/circulation delays at the intersections impacted by the proposed project, and results in fewer localized air emissions, *this alternative is not rejected*

G. REDUCED PROJECT – NO SUPERMARKET

This alternative is analyzed due to its potential to reduce noise impacts of the proposed project. This alternative assumes that no supermarket would be built on site. Instead, the currently proposed site plan with a supermarket-drugstore pad would be modified and the site would be developed with local and regional serving retail uses totaling somewhat less than the 58,000 square foot supermarket-drugstore proposal. Under this alternative, the currently proposed retail pad, fast service restaurant with drive thru and gas station/mini-mart would also be built. *Like the proposed Project that was analyzed in detail throughout the EIR, this alternative assumed a gas station/mini-mart would be provided. Replacement of this gas station/mini-mart with a 5,000 square foot retail shop as is proposed with the No Gas Station – Small Retail Shop Building alternative, would also reduce trips to this alternative site by approximately 680 trips. This reduction in trips would also lessen traffic, noise, and air quality impacts to a degree under this alternative; however, no change to the following conclusions would occur.*

1. **Project Related Impacts:** This alternative is not environmentally superior to the proposed Project. However, the minimal reduction in traffic generation would result in shorter delays at the Tavern Road/I-8 interchange ramps, Tavern Road/Arnold Way intersection, and Alpine Boulevard/West Victoria Drive/Arnold Way intersections than would occur with the proposed Project. The impacts to these intersections would still remain significant and unavoidable. This alternative would also result in slightly less noise impacts than the proposed project; however, it would result in greater regional air quality impacts than the proposed project.
2. **Other Impacts Associated with the Reduced Project – No Supermarket:** This alternative would not create any new significant impacts associated with the proposed Project. However, site design factors and building placement of several smaller retail buildings rather than one supermarket building could result in more of the site being disturbed for development and ultimately less open space on-site than would occur with the proposed Project.
3. **Project Objectives:** This alternative would not meet the basic project objectives of: a) providing convenient shopping for the resident population of Alpine and points east of the community, which will reduce drive time to comparably anchored shopping centers located further away; b) providing a nationally known major anchor tenant that is typically visited by customers two to three times a week, which will ensure the economic vitality of local serving businesses by drawing customers to the project site; c) attaining traffic and economic efficiency by encouraging a single, full-service anchor store to occupy the site, rather than several smaller stores; and d) providing a modern, state-of-the-art, neighborhood shopping center anchored by a full-size major supermarket-drugstore offering a wide variety of goods and services at a variety of price points, with a gasoline

service station, a fast service restaurant and local-serving shops in an area where such services are generally not available.

4. **Conclusion:** This alternative is rejected as infeasible because: a) it does not reduce to a level less than significant the significant and unavoidable short-term traffic/circulation impacts associated with the proposed Project; b) it does not meet many of the Project objectives; and c) there is no evidence of demand for the type or scale of general retail proposed under this alternative making this alternative potentially economically infeasible.

H. REDUCED SUPERMARKET FACILITY

This alternative is analyzed to address comments received on the previously prepared Mitigated Negative Declaration for the proposed project that the supermarket facility was too large and that a smaller supermarket would be more practical. This alternative assumes that a smaller supermarket would be built on-site. Instead of the currently proposed 58,000 square foot supermarket, the proposed supermarket-drugstore pad would be reduced to 40,000 square feet. Under this alternative, the currently proposed retail pad, fast service restaurant with drive thru and gas station/mini-mart would also be built. *Like the proposed Project that was analyzed in detail throughout the EIR, this alternative assumed a gas station/mini-mart would be provided. Replacement of this gas station/mini-mart with a 5,000 Square foot retail shop as is proposed with the No Gas Station – Small Retail Shop Building alternative, would also reduce trips to this alternative site by approximately 680 trips. This reduction in trips would also lessen traffic, noise, and air quality impacts to a degree under this alternative; however, no change to the following conclusions would occur.*

1. **Project Related Impacts:** This alternative is not environmentally superior to the proposed Project. However, the minimal reduction in traffic generation would result in shorter delays at the Tavern Road/I-8 interchange ramps, Tavern Road/Arnold Way intersection, and Alpine Boulevard/West Victoria Drive/Arnold Way intersections than would occur with the proposed Project. The impacts to these intersections would still remain significant and unavoidable. This alternative would also result in greater regional air quality impacts because the existing population base in Alpine and to the east of the site would continue to make longer trips westward along the Interstate 8 to meet some of their grocery shopping and product and service needs.
2. **Other Impacts Associated with the Reduced Supermarket Facility:** This alternative would not create any new significant impacts associated with the proposed Project.
3. **Project Objectives:** A reduced supermarket facility would not be competitive with existing and proposed grocery stores, which would interfere with the projects ability to meet the basic project objectives of: a) providing convenient shopping for the resident population of Alpine and points east of the community, which will

reduce drive time to comparably anchored shopping centers located further away; b) providing a nationally known major anchor tenant that is typically visited by customers two to three times a week, which will ensure the economic vitality of local serving businesses by drawing customers to the project site; c) attaining traffic and economic efficiency by encouraging a single, full-service anchor store to occupy the site, rather than several smaller stores; and d) providing a modern, state-of-the-art, neighborhood shopping center anchored by a full-size major supermarket-drugstore offering a wide variety of goods and services at a variety of price points, with a gasoline service station, a fast service restaurant and local-serving shops in an area where such services are generally not available.

4. **Conclusion:** This alternative is rejected as infeasible because: a) it does not reduce to a level less than significant the significant and unavoidable short-term traffic/circulation impacts associated with the proposed Project; b) it does not meet many of the Project objectives; c) it would result in greater regional air quality impacts; and d) as described in more detail on pages 4-24 and 4-25 of the FEIR, if the size of the supermarket facility is significantly reduced, this full range of goods, services, and price points cannot be provided because there would not be enough supermarket square footage to do so. This would put the facility and shopping center at a competitive disadvantage, resulting in shoppers choosing to travel to other locations to fulfill their grocery shopping and service needs. This not only results in more and longer regional vehicular trips to other facilities and thus air degradation, but also weakens the economic feasibility of not only the supermarket facility, but also the other businesses within the shopping center.

I. NO GAS STATION – SMALL RETAIL SHOP BUILDING ALTERNATIVE

This alternative is analyzed in order to address the Alpine Community Planning Group Recommendation that the gas station/mini-mart component be removed from the project and replaced with a smaller retail building not to exceed 5,000 square feet in size. This alternative assumes development of the proposed project site with the proposed supermarket, fast service restaurant and retail shops, and a retail shop building of up to 5,000 square feet in place of the gas station/mini-mart. This alternative would reduce average daily vehicle trips to the site by a net of 680 trips. After consideration of the proposed Project and the alternatives evaluated in the EIR, the decision-making body elected to approve this No Gas Station – Small Retail Shop Building alternative as described above.

1. **Project Related Impacts:** The minimal reduction in traffic generation would result in shorter delays at the Tavern Road/I-8 interchange ramps, Tavern Road/Arnold Way intersection, and Alpine Boulevard/West Victoria Drive/Arnold Way intersections than would occur with the proposed project. However, it does not reduce to a level less than significant the significant and unavoidable short-term traffic/circulation impacts associated with the proposed Project. This alternative will also result in fewer localized air emissions than the

proposed Project. This alternative is environmentally superior to the proposed Project.

2. **Other Impacts Associated with the No Gas Station – Small Retail Shop Building:** This alternative would not create any new significant impacts associated with the proposed Project.
3. **Project Objectives:** Development of this Alternative would implement most of the basic project objectives, except a gas station use would not be provided.
4. **Conclusion:** Because this alternative meets most of the basic objectives of the proposed project; results in shorter transportation/circulation delays at the intersections impacted by the proposed project, and results in fewer localized air emissions, *this alternative is not rejected, but is the project approved by the decision-making body.*